

Teresa Tenbrink



ORIGINAL

W-03514A-13-0111
W-03514A-13-00142

From: Lanny A. Kope, EdD <mela10@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 8:51 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Subject: Payson Water Company Rate Increase Request.
Attachments: Ltr to Corporation Commissioners 1-26-2014.docx
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL
2014 JAN 30 PM 4 05

Re Docket W-03514A-13-0111

I am opposed to the granting of this request and have attached a letter stating my reasons

Lanny A. Kope, EdD

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
JAN 30 2014

DOCKETED BY	nr
-------------	----

Lanny A. Kope, EdD
2785 Glengarry Way
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650
520-378-0174
mela10@earthlink.net

January 27, 2014

Commissioner Susan Bitter - Smith
Arizona Corporation Commission
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

RE: Rate Increase Request by Payson Water Company
Docket # W-03514A-13-0111
Hearing: February 4, 2014

Dear Commissioner Bitter - Smith:

I own a summer home on Mead's Ranch in Payson, Arizona. I have owned this property since 1961, and have seen many iterations of water companies involved in supplying water to us.

Currently there is a rate increase request before you which has been submitted by the Payson Water Company. This water company recently acquired our water service from Brookes Utilities, Mr. Robert Hardcastle.

The rate increase requested by The Payson Water Company is excessive and totally unwarranted. This company has made no capital improvements to the system nor has it provided any enhancements which warrant such an exorbitant rate increase. The water service is the same as it was when I first built my home in 1961. It is a gravity flow system where water is pumped up to a holding tank and then dispensed by gravity to my home.

The water pressure is minimal and has never been improved. To get adequate pressure for washing off a porch, for example, requires a booster pump be installed.

Page 2

Lanny A. Kope, EdD

Furthermore, water availability is uncertain, and I had to install a 300 gallon emergency tank at my home.

Additionally, Payson Water Company like its predecessor, Brookes Utility, is total unresponsive to its customer's needs. As an example, I am currently disputing a recent bill where it's been indicated I did not pay my January water bill. However, the bill was paid on 31 December 2013 and cleared the bank with payment being received by the Payson Water Company on 3 January 2014. I have tried for a week to contact someone at the 800 number we were given to call, but as yet I have not been able to talk with anyone.

Another example of the water company's non-responsive behavior is its failure to correct the turn-off valve issue at my property line . The box where the valve is located continually fills up with mud from run-off necessitating my having to dig the valve out whenever I want to turn on my water.

In reviewing the company test year of expenses filed, it is amazing that the expenditures for Repairs and Maintenance is approximately \$25,00 while Miscellaneous Expenses were close to \$250,000. That hardly justifies a rate increase.

In summary, the water service I receive now is no different than the service I received in 1961.

I urge you to reject this unwarranted rate increase request

Lanny A. Kope

Lanny A. Kope, EdD
Meads Ranch
Payson, Arizona

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Robert Gordon <bobgordonaz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 11:43 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to Payson Water Company: Docket W-03514A-13-0111

Dear Commissioner Bitter Smith:

I am writing to you and the other ACC Commissioners for special consideration of, and future relief from, the Rate Increase application and Curtailment Plan as introduced by Payson Water Company (PWC) in Docket W-03514A-13-0111. The Dec. 6th PWC Document 0000150385-Exhibit JW-RB3 seems to be another outrageous attempt to restrict PWC's Arizona customers from reasonable and affordable access to, and use of, water from local community water system(s) during specified times of the year. The recent PWC Curtailment Plan proposes severe and unwarranted penalties that would be applied exclusively to the residents and home owners of the East Verde Park community. Conversely, PWC argues for Rate Consolidation as an important component of the Docket rate application even though the various communities served by PWC are very diverse in size, geology and issues dealing with reliable water delivery.

The Curtailment Plan's descriptions of "violations" during voluntary and mandatory water reduction stages are absurd. See excerpt below:

During the curtailment period, the amount of water you can use is restricted based on the water level stage:

-Stage Level 1: no water restrictions

-Stage Level 2: Voluntary reduction* by 20%

-Stage Level 3: Mandatory reduction* by 30%, plus restrictions on outdoor watering

-Stage Level 4: Mandatory reduction* by 40%, plus restrictions on outdoor watering

-Stage Level 5: Mandatory reduction* by 50%, plus restrictions on outdoor watering

*Question: Reduction from what? Answer: the higher of either your previous month's water use, or the same month of either of the last 2 years.

-PWC will monitor your water meter DAILY. They will take your highest 1-day water use and multiply by 30 to arrive at a fictitious monthly use that is the basis of deciding if you are violating the curtailment restrictions

These punitive water use restrictions and associated penalties dis-regard important factors such as the varying number of users residing in each household during these arbitrary periods of time; the number of days that the dwelling is physically occupied in any baseline period of time from month to month and year to year; or any credit for the water saving devices and practices each home opener/resident has voluntarily implemented. Once instituted, the EVP resident/homeowner will have little or no recourse to limit PWC in its interpretation of the violations and payment of penalties. Residents will be forced to drill private wells or relocate so they can escape the abuse by this private water utility monopoly. After being a homeowner in EVP for over 25 years, I have to question why this out-of-state private utility, and its Payson, AZ predecessor Brooke Utilities, never upgraded the EVP wells and distribution lines; nor has any effort or investment been made to the aging community pressure tank which suffers from decades of silt build up?

On February 4th and following your careful review of the Docket W-03514A-13-0111, I urge you and the other Commissioners to unanimously reject the PWC Curtailment Plan and Rate Consolidation proposals. If the PWC rate increase and Curtailment Plan are approved by the Commission our property values will plummet and many retirees on fixed incomes will suffer. Please protect PWC "customers" from Payson Water Company's unreasonable rate increases to the basic monthly service and cost of the water pumped from the local community wells.

Thank you again for your special consideration.

Robert Gordon

11758 E. Desert Vista Drive,

Scottsdale, AZ 85541
BobGordonAZ@Gmail.com

East Verde Park
351 W. Mary Patricia Drive,
Payson, AZ 85541

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Connie Odom <rcodom@npgcable.com>
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2014 1:18 PM
To: Pierce-Web; Burns-Web; BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web; Stump-Web
Subject: Docket #W-03514A-13-0111 and W-03514A-13-0142

Chairman and Commissioners:

We are contacting you regarding applications you received on rate hikes for Payson Water Co., Inc. We understand that the cost of doing any business does go up. However, rate hikes of 100% or more are outright ridiculous! We agree that rate hikes of 10, 15 or 20% maximum are understandable and while not liked are necessary at times. In closing, please take into consideration the fact that a large portion of the regions population is retired on fixed incomes or working poor.

Sincerely,

Richard and Connie Odom, Retired Payson Residents